BSAT **BASE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM**

4401 Ford Avenue • Post Office Box 16268 • Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268 • (703) 824-2924

RP-571-F12
BSAT
8 Feb 93

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BASE STRUCTURE EVALUATION COMMITTEE (BSEC)

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 8 FEBRUARY 1993

Encl: (1) COBRA Ship Berthing Assumptions
(2) Notional Configuration Model Aircraft Assignments
(3) Weapons Station Configuration Analysis Briefing Chart
(4) Shipyard Configuration Analysis Briefing Chart

1. The twenty-eighth deliberative session of the Base Structure Evaluation Committee (BSEC) convened at 1000 on 8 February 1993, in Room 531 at the Center for Naval Analyses. All members of the BSEC were present. Members of the Base Structure Analysis Team (BSAT) staff present were (b) [redacted], and (b) [redacted]. Also present was RADM Jack Snyder, Deputy Director, Navy International Programs Office.

2. The BSEC had requested RADM Snyder to attend the deliberative session to answer questions about West Coast aviation facilities. Since there are so many West Coast aviation activities with different capabilities, the BSEC felt in need of advice from someone with "hands-on" experience with these installations. RADM Snyder has vast experience with the F-14 aircraft, both from the operational and material support sides. He has had a variety of assignments both ashore and afloat, and is uniquely qualified to discuss installations from the technical feasibility standpoint. With the possible elimination of the A-6 and the upgrade of the F-14 for long range attack capability, the geographic and training capabilities at NAS Whidbey Island become more important. The issue the BSEC wished to discuss is whether the F-14 could be based at NAS Whidbey Island, rather than at NAS Miramar, to take advantage of these capabilities.

3. RADM Snyder reviewed some of the differences between NAS Miramar and NAS Whidbey, to include size of the installation, the aircraft types assigned to each installation, the training capabilities of each installation, and weather constraints. He confirmed that the F-14s stationed at Miramar can fulfill their training syllabus in that area; accordingly, there is no particular need for them to consider a move to Whidbey. Recognizing, however, that the primary benefits of Whidbey are the airspace and lack of encroachment around the base, assuming adequate facilities such as trainers were provided at Whidbey, the F-14s could be stationed there and ultimately result in mission effectiveness equal to or better than that presently

possible at Miramar. The BSEC agreed that, if the choice were between Miramar and Whidbey or Lemoore, Miramar should be the closure candidate because of encroachment constraints not present at either of the other two air stations. At the conclusion of this discussion, at 1045, RADM Snyder departed the deliberative session, and (b) [redacted], and (b) [redacted] joined the deliberative session.

4. The BSEC acknowledged that, in developing COBRA scenarios which contemplate basing of certain types of ships, it was important for the scenarios be as realistic as possible for cost and operational purposes, while recognizing that they were not tantamount to basing decisions. Accordingly, the BSAT has utilized a computer program developed for the fleet which contains detailed maps of each naval base and which can display the berthing plan at each base using actual hull numbers to ensure full coverage of all of the vessels in the 1999 force structure plan. (b) [redacted] briefed the BSEC on the assumptions used in this computer program for berthing ships (see enclosure (1)), which will also be used in developing the COBRA scenarios for naval bases identified as closure candidates.

5. (b) [redacted] and (b) [redacted] utilized the computer program to demonstrate to the BSEC the effects of these assumptions, using two alternative closure scenarios for purposes of demonstration. The first alternative assumes that Charleston, Mobile, Staten Island, and Alameda close. The second alternative assumes that Ingleside, Pascagoula, Mobile, Newport, Staten Island, and Alameda close. In placing ships at the remaining bases, the Ships and Aircraft Supplemental Data Tables (SASDT) and S3111 (homeporting plan) were reviewed to determine those ships anticipated to be homeported in 1999 (i.e, those not decommissioned). Ships currently homeported at bases assumed to remain open were placed at those bases; ships currently homeported at bases assumed to close were placed at the open bases. Ships presently assigned to the East or West Coast were placed on the coast to which presently assigned, at the rate of 100% carrier berthing and 67% berthing for other types of ships. The BSEC discussed assignment considerations, to include whether like ship types should be assigned together for support and resource management and how to assign Reserve ships to allow for demographics, and agreed that logical substitutions should be made such that Reserve ships are placed where other Reserve ships are, and active ships are used to fill fleet concentrations where other like ships are presently based. The BSEC directed the BSAT to prepare to use the computer model for final COBRA scenario development. The BSEC adjourned at 1142 and reconvened at 1346. Members of the BSAT present when the deliberative session reconvened were (b) [redacted], (b) [redacted], (b) [redacted]

(b) (6) [redacted] and (b) [redacted].

6. (b) [redacted] reviewed possible constraints that could be applied to the configuration model for Operational Air Stations. Since the model is presently designed to assign aircraft according to the aircraft currently supported by an installation, it may be necessary to direct it to assign CH-53s at Camp Pendleton to ensure that those helicopters are assigned near ground troops. Additionally, the first runs of the model resulted in minimum capacity solutions which had average military values substantially below the current military value average. It appears that the only way to ensure no worse military value is to keep all air stations open, which fails to eliminate excess capacity.

7. (b) [redacted] showed the BSEC an example of aircraft assignments generated by the configuration model (see enclosure (2)). While this is merely a notional laydown, the BSEC agreed that it did not reflect operational reality. Accordingly, they requested that, once the BSEC has decided upon possible closure candidates, the BSAT produce an aircraft laydown which the BSEC could then modify to approximate operational requirements for purposes of requesting COBRA data. In this regard, the BSEC discussed the proposed Marine Corps laydown for 1999 and the need for aircraft proximity to carriers. Since there was some question whether the appropriate force structure numbers had been used in the notional laydown and whether the hangar and apron space had been accurately calculated, the BSEC directed the BSAT to review all of the numbers used, and to use the fewest possible rules to arrive at a proposed Operational Air Station configuration. At the conclusion of this discussion, at 1622, (b) [redacted] and (b) [redacted] departed the deliberative session, and (b) [redacted] joined the deliberative session.

8. (b) [redacted] reviewed the measures which had been established to set capacity for configuration analysis purposes for Weapons Stations (see enclosure (3)). Those measures are storage capacity, throughput capacity, and weapons maintenance capacity. The BSEC discussed what should be the primary measures for weapons stations capacity, and agreed that outload and maintenance are more crucial, since there is storage capacity at places other than ordnance activities. Additionally, they discussed whether weapons stations are "follower" activities tied to fleet concentrations, and concurred that they are not. However, more than one weapons station per coast should be required to ensure weapons capability is dispersed for safety reasons (e.g., environmental restrictions and natural disasters).

They requested the BSAT to take these discussions into consideration in conducting the configuration analysis.

9. (b) [redacted] then reviewed the measures which had been established to set capacity for configuration analysis purposes for Shipyards, which are direct labor mandays (see enclosure (4)). The BSEC discussed whether the configuration analysis should solve for total requirements or just for nuclear requirements, and agreed that the configuration model should seek to reduce nuclear capability to the minimum required.

10. The deliberative session adjourned at 1704 on 8 February 1993.

(b) (6) [redacted]

(b) [redacted]
LtCol, USMCR
Recording Secretary

SHIPYARD CONFIGURATION ANALYSIS

-MEASURES

NUCLEAR - DIRECT LABOR MANDAYS

TOTAL - DIRECT LABOR MANDAYS

Enclosure (4)